

**HB 2654**  
**Workgroup Meeting #1**  
**April 29, 2008**  
**SL 03- OB-2 Olympia**

**Document Purpose:** This document summarizes the notes taken on the white board and flip charts during the meeting.

**Meeting Attendees:** The people listed below attended the work group meeting.

Ken Stark	Stephanie Lane	Andy Toulon	Sue Allen	Dawn Grosz
Cathii Nash				Margaret Rojas
Mary Jadwisiak				Laura Van Tosh
Brad Berry				Karie Castleberry
Lenora Warden				Frank Jose
Judy Ebbert-Rich				Aunrico Williams
Cathy Clem				Tamara Johnson
Bill Waters				Don Nichols
Jessica Bayne				Clifford Thurston
Andy Keller				Tony O’Leary

**Meeting Process:** The meeting began with each person stating their goals for the day (summarized below). We then continued with an in-depth presentation and discussion led and facilitated by Laura Van Tosh regarding the history of the consumer movement and the history of consumer-run services. This discussion was very wide-ranging and provided a solid foundation for the work that followed. The remainder of this document summarizes the notes taken on the white board and flip charts during the meeting.

**Goals for Today’s Meeting**

Andy K.- Leave understanding group’s input and guidance as a whole

Jessica- Leave feeling that the group as a whole feels good about the decisions made during the meeting

Bill- Develop process of license/certification so consumer-run services may access funds with accountability, fidelity

Cathy- Concerned to hear from people who use the services - Do not want to force a license/certification process- Diversity and integrity and not medicalizing consumer-run services - Need alternative to bean counting

Judie- Echo Cathy- Add in accountability- Need family and consumer organizations to be accountable, not just be licensed or certified

Lenore- Make it real and personal- Importance of a process that appreciates where she comes from- Have partners in her dream to be a full respected citizen and be well accountability

Brad- Better understand the agenda and how to move forward

Mary- Leave knowing all work group members and attendees were able to listen

Cathii- Define consumer run and operated services, 6 RSNs did not know what they are- need to move beyond discussions just of Title-XIX and Access to Care Standards and include use of federal block grant and other funds

Ken- Verify assumption that group/organizational representatives share and get input and that we do not marginalize consumer-run services through the process of definition

Stephanie- “Optimism of Uncertainty” – zigzag of daily acts, small acts, importance of involvement in something worthwhile

**HB 2654**  
**Workgroup Meeting #1**  
**April 29, 2008**  
**SL 03- OB-2 Olympia**

Andy T.- He wants to better know what consumer means. Prosumer? Peer Support? Clubhouse? Family Support? Clinical or no? Noted importance of vetting process with multiple other groups TWG-CTP, WCMHC

Sue- Sense of having Voice and Partnership for Washington stakeholders

Dawn- Develop and communicate clarity about different groups encompassed in Washington's definition of "consumer"; step back to be clear about the roles of parents, caregivers, and youth and how they fit in this process, develop guidance for others

Laura- Practical goal to 1) Diversify funding sources for consumer-run services beyond traditional public funding sources (Medicaid, state funds, federal Block Grant) to include foundations, the VA system and, 2) develop a TA plan and gear up now

Karie- 1) Feel reconnected 2) Know where we are at and be 3) Resource 4) Add older adults

Frank- Do not lose sight of the end: recovery- practice incremental intentionality- have consumers and families be distinct but not in conflict- do not lose advocacy focus

Aunrico- Friendship

Tamara- Better understanding of the role of how youth can implement youth-guided, youth-directed, a youth-driven-partnerships- youth need to be true partners, not just a piece of the process

Don- Clear understanding to share with other consumers and to help empower others

Tony- How will we know when we are getting it right, specifically?- wants clear definitions, ability to measure and evaluate

Clifford- Significant involvement of consumers

**Additional Rules to Add to Those Proposed by Andy K in his presentation**

- Not undermine workgroup process and support the integrity of the workgroup process outside the room
- Definition of consumer and role of professionals
- Define key terms- multiple definitions may be needed
- Consumers as self-identified
- Include consideration of financing across multiple agencies – MHD, DASA, DD

<b>Brainstorm of Consumer-Run Services/ Supports</b>	<b>Groups to Access the Service/Support</b>		
	<b>Direct Consumers Y(outh) A(dult) O(lder)</b>	<b>P(arent and caregivers)</b>	<b>F(amily) Members</b>
Peer Support	YAO	P	F
Peer Advocate (navigator upfront)	YAO	P	F
Psychiatric Services			
Brokerage (self directed)	YAO	P	F
School Support, Special Education (IDEA, 504)	Y	P	
Transitional Services; child to adult (ages 17-24)	YA		
Resiliency Support	Y		
Referral to other services (professional, community)	YAO	P	F
Resource and Support Groups and Coordinators	YAO	P	F
Crisis Services (consumer run); jail/hospital diversion	YAO		
Transportation	YAO	P	F
Respite	YAO	P	F
Housing/Employment	YAO	P	F
Youth-Guided, Consumer-run Program Evaluation	YAO	P	F

**HB 2654**  
**Workgroup Meeting #1**  
**April 29, 2008**  
**SL 03- OB-2 Olympia**

<b>Brainstorm of Consumer-Run Services/ Supports</b>	<b>Groups to Access the Service/Support</b>		
<b>Services</b>	<b>Direct Consumers Y(outh) A(dult) O(lder)</b>	<b>P(arent and caregivers)</b>	<b>F(amily) Members</b>
Warm Line	YAO	P	F
Self Help Centers	YAO	P	F
Hospital Transition/Community Reentry	YAO	P	F
Social/Recreational	YAO	P	F
Community Centers/Drop in Centers	YAO	P	F
Budgeting and Saving Programs	YAO	P	F
Life Skills Interventions	Y		
Education/Training Responsive to local needs	YAO	P	F
Learning Academies	YAO	P	F
Health / Wellness/ Smoking Cessation	YAO	P	F

**Next Steps to Finish Services List and Identify Services to Include in Report**

- Need to assess feasibility of the services and ultimately develop a plan
- Look at RSN lists and plans and identify opportunities
- Prioritize, being sure to tie services to needs/strengths of people to be served, also weighing potential of unique impacts
- List of services should be defined so it is open to development and new services over time and not closed
- Include existing programs
- Stephanie will provide list to those who want it of current services and resources (Toolkit, information from Jean Campbell)
- Interested in helping develop list of consumer-run services – Brad, Cathii, Dawn, Lenora, Tamara
- Cathy will get input from other parents and caregivers

**Next Steps to Identify and Address Financing and Certification Issues**

- Look at what are other states doing
- Clarify the limits to Medicaid funding; support a broad base of funding options
- Define opportunities of Medicaid at multiple points in time
  - Limited opportunities in short term
  - More opportunities possibly in medium term (5 years out)
  - Be sure to address belief that legislature expects Medicaid to be a major source of funding for expanded consumer-run services
  - Define role of TA in supporting increased access to Medicaid funding over time
- Develop a Continuum of “Sanctioning” Options
  - Lower level requirements- example of requirements to be included in Information and Referral process by NAMI or RSN
  - Higher level requirements- Certification to receive State (both MH and other agencies) and Medicaid funding
  - Sanctioning would be a step to broader array of funding
- Independent Operators that do not want to be part of state-sanctioned system; be sure not to leave them out

**HB 2654**  
**Workgroup Meeting #1**  
**April 29, 2008**  
**SL 03- OB-2 Olympia**

- Develop a statewide infrastructure to support consumer-run services
- Have funding that is not linked to certification
- Explore role of the 1/10<sup>th</sup> of 1% local tax option
- What is the role of Tribes?
- Consider establishing consumer-run services as a required priority for RSN funding
  - Could use federal block grant funds to initiate, then grow and use other funding
  - As organizations progress along “Sanctioning Continuum”, they can access other funds (MHD, other agencies such as DASA, DD, ultimately Medicaid)
- Be sure to include measurement of outcomes
- Don discussed a dozen funding options he identified to support clubhouses
- Focus on broad, diverse funding
- Balance between:
  - Need to demonstrate accountability and build trust
  - Costs of enhanced state oversight – risk of liability, fraud
- Tension with providers;
  - Value of peer support vs. case management
  - Competition for non-Medicaid funds
- CTP and Medicaid- identified risks in a consumer-run organization developing the capacity to bill Medicaid; it is costly to do and may change an organization’s mission- Medicaid is deficit-based
- The group applauds MHD’s efforts in Pierce County
- Need to address internal stigma in the system- idea that “someone (a MH professional) has to oversee” peer services to be sure they are sound- do not want to tie consumer-run services to MH Professional oversight
- Innovative Services Grant
  - These are state grants
  - Recovery Center – Judy Gosney developing an RFP for this

**Next Steps to Develop Recommendations on TA**

- Tie to measurement of outcomes
- Ultimate dream: A consumer-run TA center- serving youth, adults, older adults
- Pilots for specific consumer-run services (State Senate is reportedly interested in this)
- Concern about stigma and need for TA to address stigma
  - Public education
  - Include the Legislature
- Potential of Regional Resources Centers (Cathii was involved in drafting of a bill); this would be a place for individuals to go to access multiple sources of help in one location
- TA to help consumer-run service providers access funding – diverse funding
- Educate RSNs- use lessons from other states
  - TA for RSNs on certification; RSNs need guidance on how to fund and sanction consumer-run services
- Include research on successful TA models in the report

**HB 2654**  
**Workgroup Meeting #1**  
**April 29, 2008**  
**SL 03- OB-2 Olympia**

**Commitments of Time and Effort from the Workgroup Between Now and Next Meeting (in late July)**

Laura – Will summarize research, get feedback from others, participate in TA development process

Margaret – Participate in Funding/Certification/TA Workteam

Dawn- Participate in Services Workteam; will also get input from constituents

Sue- Participate in Funding/Certification/TA Workteam; goal to sort through confusion of multiple roles

Mary- May participate in TA Workteam

Stephanie- Will do her job; share write-up on optimism

Cathii- Participate in Services/TA Workteam; will also share national input on services and funding

Brad- Help with all Workteams

Bill- Participate in Funding/Certification/TA Workteam

Cathy- Will get input from support group

Judie- Participate in TA Workteam; will get input thru the Village

Tony- Wants to set a “high bar”- develop standards for Certification, Sanction, Accountability

Don- Join RSN Advisory Board; will share funding options and get input

Clifford- Will attend next meeting

Lenora- Participate in Services Workteam

Tamara- Participate in Services Workteam